

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-16, 18, 22-24 and 26 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 15 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 15, and 18 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Statement of Substance of Interview***

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, Applicants provide the following statement of substance of the interview. Applicants express their appreciation to Examiner Popham for the courtesy of a telephonic interview with Applicants' representatives, Robert Sokohl and Kavon Nasabzadeh, on May 13, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed clarifying amendments to claim 1 to further distinguish over the art of record.

An agreement was reached. In particular, Applicants' representatives agreed to amend claim 1 to recite "moving a first interrupt indicator associated with the first control record onto a second interrupt indicator associated with the second control record before processing of the second data completes" to overcome the references of record. Applicants' representative further agreed to amend claim 15 to recite a similar distinguishing feature to overcome the references of record.

***Objection to the Claims***

Claim 18 was objected to for alleged informalities in the claim language. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the objection, Applicants have amended claim 15 to accommodate the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 15 and 18 be reconsidered and withdrawn

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, and 14**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,064 to Wang et al. (“Wang”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,179 to Bashford (“Bashford”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection and solely to expedite prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite features that distinguish over the applied references. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “moving a first interrupt indicator associated with the first control record onto a second interrupt indicator associated with the second control record before processing of the second data completes.” As agreed during the telephonic interview between Applicants’ representatives and the Examiner, the combination of Wang and Bashford does not teach or suggest at least this feature.

Because the combination of Wang and Bashford does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, they cannot render that claim unpatentable. Claims 3, 4, 8-12, and 14 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of

Wang and Bashford for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 2, 15, 16, 18, 22-24, 26, and 23**

Claims 2, 15, 16, 18, 22-24, 26, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wang in view of Bashford and in further view of Pierson et al., “Context-Agile Encryption for High Speed Communication Networks” (“Pierson”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Pierson does not in anyway remedy the deficiencies of Wang and Bashford with respect to independent claim 1, as discusses above. Consequently, the combination of Wang, Bashford, and Pierson cannot render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Claim 2 is similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Wang, Bashford, and Pierson for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which it depends, and further in view of its own respective feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 recites, among other features “wherein moving the first interrupt indicator comprises setting the first interrupt indicator associated with the first control record to disabled and setting the second interrupt indicator associated with the second control record to enabled before processing of the second control record completes.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Wang and Bashford do not teach or suggest such at least this feature. Pierson does not cure the deficiencies of Wang and Bashford. Consequently, the combination of Wang, Bashford, and Pierson cannot render

independent claim 15 unpatentable. Claims 16, 18, 22-24, and 26 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Wang, Bashford, and Pierson for the same reasons as independent claim 15, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-18, 22-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 8/11/01

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

1093991\_1.DOC

Atty. Dkt. No. 2875.0440001